



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/702,290	11/06/2003	Dan Tyroler	H0005391 (16881)	8063
128 7590 03/05/2008 HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC. 101 COLUMBIA ROAD P O BOX 2245 MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962-2245			EXAMINER LAI, ANNE VIET NG	
			ART UNIT 2612	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 03/05/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/702,290	Applicant(s) TYROLER, DAN	
	Examiner ANNE V. LAI	Art Unit 2612	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 January 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4 and 6-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-4, 6-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Stilp** [US 7,019,639] in view of **Crabtree** (previously provided).

In claims 1-4, **Stilp** discloses a security system with an object locator feature (abstract, col. 43, l. 34-61), comprising: a user interface device (keypad 500, figs. 5A-5B and 21) including an input keypad, a display output, a memory 266, a controller function 250, and a transmitter RF communication 422 (col. 44, l. 12-64).

(See also controller with keypad 340 and its components in figs. 2 and 5 of **Stilp** [US 7,053,764]).

The memory storing identifiers for electronic tags associated with a plurality of object is inherent or obvious since the controller communicates with various electronic tags attached to sensors, readers or gateways (col. 10, l. 17- col. 12, l. 3); the memory also stores descriptive information of the plurality of objects (labeling, col. 45, l. 25-48).

Stilp discloses the keypad 500 is a mechanism by which authorized persons can arm or disarm the system and view the status of various zones (col. 44, l. 46-61), the descriptive information may be obvious however **Stilp** does not show the descriptive information on his drawings, **Crabtree** teaches an object locator device comprising a

Art Unit: 2612

user interface, a memory, an output component with descriptive information to aid user selecting object, a control to retrieve the tag identifier and a transmitter features as claimed (Locator device 10 with name list display and keypad select, fig. 4, col. 15-60; transceiver tag 11 attached to a child responsive to polling from the locator device for sending information regarding the child proximity to water or fire (security system), col. 15, l. 25-55).

It can be seen the output descriptive information of Crabtree locator implemented in Stilp device facilitates the user in selecting the object for polling.

In claims 6-8, **Stilp** discloses editing/labeling (col. 45, l. 25-48); **Crabtree** (col. 15, lines 15-60) teaches user input for storing in memory string of characters and numbers representing the tags identifiers and editing via user input descriptive information for the plurality of objects.

In claims 9-10, **Stilp** discloses both inanimate objects and living beings (col. 43, 34-61).

In claims 11-15, **Stilp** and **Crabtree** combined disclose a method for operating the system of claims 1-4 and 6-10 above; **Stilp** discloses authorized users only can access the editing and creating labels (col. 45, l. 25-48), and authorized user is the one that has been assigned a unique passcode (col. 16, l. 53-56), therefore check matching passcode would have been obvious; **Crabtree** teaches the operation for inputting the identifiers, descriptive information, entering character string (col. 15, l. 28-60).

In claims 16-21, **Stilp** discloses editing/labeling using a computer (col. 45, l. 25-48); **Crabtree** teach the system having automated functions (col. 2, line 51 through col.

3, line 24) therefore program storage device and program instructions to function the system of claims 1-10 would have been obvious.

In claims 22-23, **Crabtree** teach an electronic tag having memory, receiver, control comparing identifier and sounder as claimed; the electronic tag responses to the polling from the locator to report a danger (water, fire) (col. 10, l. 28- col. 11, l. 13; col. 4, l. 25-67; col. 25, l. 19-23). **Stilp** discloses a security system keypad that allows communication with selected RFID readers to view the status of various zones in the security system (col. 44, l. 46-64). It has been obvious the locator of Crabtree or the security system keypad of Stilp can be implemented in either Crabtree or Stilp as design choice for polling an electronic tag of choice.

In claim 24, **Crabtree** teaches scheduled polling (col. 23 line 7- col. 24 line 21; Table 2).

In claims 25-26, **Stilp** discloses a distributed controller functions in the security system with one master controller, all controllers keep a copy of all parameters, tables and status but not duplicating the actions of the master controller (col. 10, l. 3-col. 11, l. 11), the controller function can be located within the RFID readers, the RFID gateways, and the keypad for the security system (col. 6, l. 1-12). Stilp also discloses all controllers having an interface, a memory and a control function (figs. 5A-5B, col. 44, l. 46-64). **Crabtree** teaches the polling feature.

Therefore it would have been obvious the control function in the keypad of Stilp combined can be considered the first control section of the claimed limitation, and the

Art Unit: 2612

control function in the master controller can be considered the second control section of the control panel.

3. Claims 1-4, 6-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Wesby** in view of **Crabtree** (all previously provided).

In claims 1-4, 6-10, **Wesby** discloses a security system with an object locator feature with user interface device and control integrated in a security system keypad as claimed (wireless mobile electronic tag 10 inserted in any mobile communication device having a keypad, a display for user interface, a memory, a control function and a transmitter) (abstract; col. 4, l. 65-col. 5, l. 14, security in prison, airport, military, claim 8; unauthorized entry, claim 9; home security, burglar, fire, claim 13).

Wesby does not have the limitation of the claimed descriptive information.

Crabtree does. (See previous office action).

In claim 11-21, **Wesby** discloses the use of password to prevent access to stored data is well known in the computing environment (col. 2, l. 20-21, l. 27), therefore it would have been obvious an object locator having passcode verification feature would be needed to prevent unauthorized user editing the stored data. (See also previous office action).

In claims 22-23, **Wesby** discloses in claim 9, smart tag carried by personnel receiving a wireless ID signal that was retrieved by a security system keypad, i.e. keypad entry from the local system server service platform to retrieve ID from database for polling the smart tag; claim 20 discloses scheduled or periodic polling. (See also previous office action).

In claim 25-26, **Wesby** 's claim 9 can be read as following: a remote controlling means (supervisor) responsive to user input for retrieving a stored identifier of an electronic tag associated with a selected object (burglar alarm, security camera), and generating a wireless enable signal to a control panel (local server platform); and in response to the enable signal, the local server platform transmits the wireless signal encoded with identifier according to a polling schedule (periodic polling, claim 20).

The remote controlling of Wesby is a PDA with keypad, it would have been obvious a remote locator type of **Crabtree** with keypad could be used for the advantage of the descriptive information facilitates the selection of object to be polled.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments filed 1/29/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant argument regarding Wesby does not describe "a security system". The paragraph 19 of applicant's specification discloses the term "security" encompasses security from intrusion as well as fire. Wesby' claim 13 discloses burglar alarms, intruder detection and fire, obviously the system of Wesby is a security system. See office action above.

Conclusion


5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to ANNE V. LAI whose telephone number is (571)272-2974. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 am to 6:30 pm, Monday to Thursday.

Art Unit: 2612

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hofsass Jeffery can be reached on 571-272-2981 or, Acting supervisor Goins Davetta at 571-272-2957. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AVL


DAVETTA W. GOINS
PRIMARY EXAMINER